



PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

PCT

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY REPORT ON PATENTABILITY
(Chapter II of the Patent Cooperation Treaty)

(PCT Article 36 and Rule 70)

Applicant's or agent's file reference 020638PCT	FOR FURTHER ACTION		See Form PCT/IPEA/416
International application No. PCT/JP2003/012022	International filing date (<i>day/month/year</i>) 19 September 2003 (19.09.2003)	Priority date (<i>day/month/year</i>) 20 September 2002 (20.09.2002)	
International Patent Classification (IPC) or national classification and IPC H04L 9/08			
Applicant PIONEER CORPORATION			

1. This report is the international preliminary examination report, established by this International Preliminary Examining Authority under Article 35 and transmitted to the applicant according to Article 36.

2. This REPORT consists of a total of 5 sheets, including this cover sheet.

3. This report is also accompanied by ANNEXES, comprising:

a. (*sent to the applicant and to the International Bureau*) a total of 3 sheets, as follows:

sheets of the description, claims and/or drawings which have been amended and are the basis of this report and/or sheets containing rectifications authorized by this Authority (see Rule 70.16 and Section 607 of the Administrative Instructions).

sheets which supersede earlier sheets, but which this Authority considers contain an amendment that goes beyond the disclosure in the international application as filed, as indicated in item 4 of Box No. I and the Supplemental Box.

b. (*sent to the International Bureau only*) a total of (indicate type and number of electronic carrier(s)) _____, containing a sequence listing and/or tables related thereto, in computer readable form only, as indicated in the Supplemental Box Relating to Sequence Listing (see Section 802 of the Administrative Instructions).

4. This report contains indications relating to the following items:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. I	Basis of the report
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. II	Priority
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. III	Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. IV	Lack of unity of invention
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. V	Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VI	Certain documents cited
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VII	Certain defects in the international application
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VIII	Certain observations on the international application

Date of submission of the demand 20 April 2004 (20.04.2004)	Date of completion of this report 21 January 2005 (21.01.2005)
Name and mailing address of the IPEA/JP	Authorized officer
Facsimile No.	Telephone No.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY REPORT ON PATENTABILITY

Box No. I Basis of the report

1. With regard to the language, this report is based on the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.

This report is based on translations from the original language into the following language _____, which is language of a translation furnished for the purpose of:

- international search (under Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b))
- publication of the international application (under Rule 12.4)
- international preliminary examination (under Rules 55.2 and/or 55.3)

2. With regard to the elements of the international application, this report is based on (replacement sheets which have been furnished to the receiving Office in response to an invitation under Article 14 are referred to in this report as "originally filed" and are not annexed to this report):

The international application as originally filed/furnished

the description:

pages _____ 1-32, as originally filed/furnished

pages* _____ received by this Authority on _____

pages* _____ received by this Authority on _____

the claims:

pages _____, as originally filed/furnished

pages* _____, as amended (together with any statement) under Article 19

pages* 1-7 received by this Authority on 19 October 2004 (19.10.2004)

pages* _____ received by this Authority on _____

the drawings:

pages _____ 1-18, as originally filed/furnished

pages* _____ received by this Authority on _____

pages* _____ received by this Authority on _____

a sequence listing and/or any related table(s) -- see Supplemental Box Relating to Sequence Listing.

3. The amendments have resulted in the cancellation of:

the description, pages _____

the claims, Nos. 8, 9

the drawings, sheets/figs _____

the sequence listing (specify): _____

any table(s) related to sequence listing (specify): _____

4. This report has been established as if (some of) the amendments annexed to this report and listed below had not been made, since they have been considered to go beyond the disclosure as filed, as indicated in the Supplemental Box (Rule 70.2(c)).

the description, pages _____

the claims, Nos. _____

the drawings, sheets/figs _____

the sequence listing (specify): _____

any table(s) related to sequence listing (specify): _____

* If item 4 applies, some or all of those sheets may be marked "superseded."

Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability

The questions whether the claimed invention appears to be novel, to involve an inventive step (to be non obvious), or to be industrially applicable have not been examined in respect of:

- the entire international application.
 claims Nos. _____ 7

because:

- the said international application, or the said claims Nos. _____ 7
 relate to the following subject matter which does not require an international preliminary examination (*specify*):

That information is produced by a specific system has nothing to do with the recording medium having the information recorded. So, the recording medium having the information recorded is a mere presentation of information.

The applicant insists in the written reply to the effect that key information has a function of controlling the reproduction of the information recorded in a recording medium. However, since key information per se cannot have a function of controlling an apparatus, the insistence is groundless.

- the description, claims or drawings (*indicate particular elements below*) or said claims Nos. _____
 are so unclear that no meaningful opinion could be formed (*specify*):

- the claims, or said claims Nos. _____ are so inadequately supported
 by the description that no meaningful opinion could be formed.

- no international search report has been established for said claims Nos. _____

- the nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence listing does not comply with the standard provided for in Annex C of the Administrative Instructions in that:

the written form has not been furnished

does not comply with the standard

the computer readable form has not been furnished

does not comply with the standard

- the tables related to the nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence listing, if in computer readable form only, do not comply with the technical requirements provided for in Annex C-bis of the Administrative Instructions.

- see Supplemental Box for further details.

International application No.

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY REPORT ON PATENTABILITY

PCT/JP03/12022

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement**Novelty (N)**

Claims

YES

Claims

1-6

NO

Inventive step (IS)

Claims

YES

Claims

1-6

NO

Industrial applicability (IA)

Claims

1-6

YES

Claims

NO

2. Citations and explanations (Rule 70.7)

Document 1: The LSD Broadcast Encryption Scheme, Lecture Notes in Computer Science, Vol. 2442, pages 47-60, 9 September, 2002 (date of acceptance at JICST), 2.2 The Basic LSD Scheme, 2.3 The General LSD Scheme

The subject matters of claims 1-6 do not appear to be novel in view of document 1 newly cited in the IPER. Document 1 describes that key information is allocated to the difference sets based on a hierarchically classified tree structure. Since difference sets are produced for respective ranks, it is considered that the difference sets are produced independently for respective ranks.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

The following observations on the clarity of the claims, description, and drawings or on the question whether the claims are fully supported by the description, are made:

Claims 1 and 5 describe, "the difference set of a receiver allocated to a leaf of the said partial tree existing in a rank below an ancestral node and not existing in a rank below a descendant node or a leaf of the said tree structure existing below the leaf of the said partial tree." However, what is a leaf of a partial tree existing or not existing in "a rank" in this description is unknown. Furthermore, what is "the difference set" of a receiver allocated to such a leaf is also unknown.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY